

SOUTH WEBER CITY COUNCIL WORK MEETING

DATE OF MEETING: 17 May 2016

TIME COMMENCED: 5:30 p.m.

PRESENT: MAYOR:

Tammy Long

COUNCILMEMBERS:

Scott Casas

Kent Hyer (excused)

Marlene Poore

Merv Taylor (excused)

Jo Sjoblom

CITY RECORDER:

Elyse Greiner

CITY MANAGER:

Tom Smith

Transcriber: Minutes transcribed by Michelle Clark

VISITORS: Mark McRae, Jan Ukena, Lynn Poll, Mark Roginske, Mark Loucks, Dick Miller, Ryan Wilde, and Carly Brown.

Hill Air Force Base Environmental Update; Carly Brown: Mark Loucks, Mark Roginske, and Carly Brown were in attendance from HAFB. Jan Ukena represents South Weber City on the board. Information in the packet includes project manager's phone numbers, maps identifying the contamination.

Mark Roginske pointed out the chemicals in the two plumes and stated they are bolic (meaning they want to be in the air verses the groundwater). He then discussed air sampling indoors for chemicals found in groundwater. He said action levels are established for each chemical with EPA and UDEQ approval. He said they most likely see vapor intrusion from the groundwater. He said the vapor intrusion in South Weber is a little bit different. He said there are 61 homes in the affected area. 60 homes were sampled since 2003. He said 12 homes agreed to sample in 2016. 5 homes were detected with above action level and 55 homes were detected below action level. In 2016, there was one home detected above action level and 11 homes detected below action level. He said 5 homes have vapor removals systems, and one sewer vent fan pending. He then explained the procedure for a vapor intrusion system which pulls the vapors out of the foundation. He said they have detected vapor intrusion in the sewer. Council Member Poore asked how the boundaries of the plumes were established. Mark said they have installed groundwater monitoring wells. Lynn Poll asked if OU1 is cleaned up. Mark Loucks said the plume is shrinking for OU1. Lynn asked about the area on the hillside that is next to OU1 where an area was roped off at one time and a sign placed stating the area was toxic. The ropes were then removed. Mark Loucks explained the risk assessment completed on the hillside that stated there is no risk. Lynn is concerned about areas in the City where HAFB has paid people to not use their property, but those living above the area haven't received anything. Lynn said HAFB is the checkers and they can do anything they want with the information and nobody ever checks

them. Mark Loucks said the State and EPA regulate us and they have determined what we have here. He is all for having someone independent reviewing the information. He said there is a Restoration Advisory Board. He said they have not put anyone in danger. He said they are working on cleaning up areas where there are problems. Lynn said John Carter did review the facts and has opposite points of views.

Mark Loucks explained and identified OU2. He discussed Clay/Zero Valent Iron Soil Mixing. He said this process takes big equipment and will be visible in South Weber. He said they will test this technology in a small area first. Mayor Long asked about the development going on the Reynolds property area. Mark Roginske said barriers can be installed prior to construction that will help. He suggested individuals contact him and he will discuss the procedure with them. Mark Loucks then reviewed what is happening with OU4. He said in July 2015 they revised the proposed plan then they started drafting a record of decision amendment. He said 22 June 2016 there will be a public meeting at the Riverdale Recreation Center. He discussed the eastern landfill that will have a low-permeability cap installed.

ACTION:

Old Fort Road Project: Tom discussed the sweeping “T” coming off of Interstate 84 and onto 475 East. He said many are asking why the City is building Old Fort Road. In 2014, the City took nearly a year in updating the City’s General Plan. Feedback from the City residents was sought at: (1) public open houses, (2) with online surveys, and (3) and multiple public hearings.

Tom then reviewed the vehicle transportation master plan that identifies the location of Old Fort Road. He said the City is not doing this project to benefit a developer. He said the City has master planned Old Fort Road and the developer needs a fully improved road to access their development. These two reasons are why both entities are participating in the cost, and are what makes this type of project possible. If either entity were to try and do the project on its own, the total cost would not make the project financially practical.

Tom said the anticipated project is only building the road to the east end of the Posse Grounds (up to the Stan Cook property). This is only the first phase of the project. This road will eventually connect to Old Fort Road (which turns into 1200 East) at South Weber Drive. The remaining section in between will be built by developers as those properties are developed. The other portion could be built by the City and paid for with impact fees if demand was high enough and the City wanted to do that as needed.

It is estimated the project will take three to four months. The asphalt pavement width will be 50 feet wide. There will be two traveling lanes (a center turn lane and bike lanes on both sides). There is also a 10 foot wide trail planned to run along the north side of the road. There will also be a 6 foot wide sidewalk on the south side of the road.

Tom said some may ask why it needs to be addressed right now. He said there is property acquisition, project design, development agreement, and expense. Tom discussed property acquisition which includes the following properties:

1. Stephens property
2. Rocky Mountain Power

3. The Lamberson Property
4. Spaulding Property
5. Riverside Place Subdivision
6. Road Dedication Plat
7. Appraisals
8. Temporary Turnaround

Tom said the City is currently working with Rocky Mountain Power (RMP) to bury the small overhead power lines from 475 East to the Spaulding home. RMP is assessing the cost to move the power poles and the cost to put the power in the underground. The difference in the cost between the two is what the City will have to pay in order to bury the power line. Going underground also means the City would need to cover the expense of running the power to each home's meter and removing the overhead components. The City does not have the results from RMP's cost assessment yet, but we'll obviously need that before a decision is made to bury the power line or just move the poles. Tom said the power substation will need to have a hammerhead driveway in order to allow them to pull off of the road with their service trucks and then pull out straight when pulling back onto the road.

Tom said a geotechnical study has been completed by GSH Geotechnical dated April 26, 2016.

J&A has completed a "tentative final" version of plans for the City to review. He then discussed drainage on 6650 South. He said in several Planning Commission public hearings, where J&A has attended for the development of the ground west of 475 East and north of 6650 South, there have been concerns of drainage problems. Because this project would include the current intersection of 6650 South and 475 East, J&A has included an extension of the storm drain west (approximately 240 feet) down 6650 South to pick up the end of the curb and gutter on the south side of the road where the current major problem of ponded water exists. It is important to know that this extension can also be used in the future if curb and gutter is ever installed on this road. If the project moves forward, the Council will need to confirm whether or not the City wants extension included in this project.

Tom discussed the development agreement.

1. Original Version: The initial draft of the Development Agreement included the following participation of the project cost. The City and MB-South Weber Land LLC had agreed to participate at these amounts, but Bruce Stephens never did.
 - a. Douglas B. Stephens @ 39.7% = \$472,067.20 (includes a \$53,101.58 credit for extra property taken for the new intersection).
 - b. MB-South Weber Land LLC @ 28.5% = \$377,010.33
 - c. South Weber City @ 31.8% = \$479,336.80 (includes an extra \$58,672.64 cost for the extra ground needed for the new intersection and Lamberson's property).
 - d. Total Project Cost = \$1,322,843.28
2. Revised Agreement Needed: Due to the fact that Bruce Stephens is not willing to participate in the roadway improvements in the amount originally calculated, the Development Agreement will need to be revised. As such, J&A has updated the cost estimate for the project. The following costs summarize the current participation status:
 - a. Total Project Cost = \$1,236,422.00

- b. MB-South Weber Land LLC (Riverside Place Subdivision) @ 28.5% = \$352,380.27
- c. Douglas B. Stephens @ a total participation of \$170,000.00
- d. South Weber City @ 31.8% = \$393,182.20
- e. Remaining Amount = \$320,859.53

Tom said the Council need to understand that the City would need to come up with additional amount (\$320,859.53) to cover “remaining amount.” If the City chose to do this, the total estimated cost for the City would be \$714,041.73. The Development Agreement would then be revised accordingly if the City and MB-South Weber Land LLC are willing to participate under the revised conditions. He assumes that Bruce Stephens will participate as long as his conditions remain unchanged.

Tom reviewed expenses to date which are as follows:

	<u>Budget</u>	<u>Spent</u>
Engineering to Jones & Associates	\$45,000.00	
• Old Fort Road – ROW Acquisition		\$19,510.50
• Old Fort Road – Final Design		<u>\$ 3,553.50</u>
Subtotal (J&A)		\$23,064.00
Other Consultants		
Geotechnical Report (GSH Geotechnical)		\$ 4,700.00
Survey – property and topographical (Hansen & Assoc)		\$ 7,811.30
Total Spent on Project		\$35,575.30

The City has two options. Option #1 – the City moves forward with a new development agreement between the City, Miller/Bates Inc., and Bruce Stephens or Option #2 – the City walks away from the project and the developer continues with their project.

Council Member Casas said he recently heard that the area above the toll road in South Ogden will be developing. He said this is an example of a road that was constructed and then development is now going in.

Tom discussed the disadvantages of Option #1 being expense is more than what was anticipated; no road, no impact fee money; developer moves forward on the project and the City potentially gets a standard local residential road that is sufficient for the development only at a later date; Mr. Stephens could change his mind and decide not to deed the City a portion of his property at a later date; and cost of completing the project at a later date would likely be more expensive and there would be no second party contribution.

Tom discussed the disadvantages of Option #2 being the money that has been spent thus far on the project is now in vain; there may or may not be money in the budget as water reservoir type project comes along in the coming years; the City potentially gets a standard local residential road at a later date, with no additional developer or landowner contribution; developer moves forward on the project and the City gets their portion towards a future local residential road bonded to be installed at a later date; no “bundling” developers project with 475 East and

Raymond Drive; costs of completing the project at a later date would likely be more expensive; and the City forgoes an opportunity that could be an economic benefit to the City.

Tom said in summary, the City has already expressed, of their own volition (not development), that they want Old Fort Road to be constructed by way of the VTMP; the City has 2nd and 3rd party contributions equaling approximately \$200,000, monetary out of pocket to date is \$35,575.30; Old Fort Road was goal #1 for completion in the January Summit and is currently in the FY 16-17 budget for completion; the model of operation that has plagued South Weber City for years from accomplishing Council goals is that the governing bodies deliberate on a course of action, spend money on plans, do nothing i.e. Canyon Meadows Park, Central Park, and now possibly the City's general and master plans.

Council Member Poore is concerned about not knowing all the costs associated with Rocky Mountain Power. She discussed the \$522,000 in cash contributions and feels the City should err on the side of caution. Tom said we have budgeted in excess. Council Member Casas realizes there are unforeseen items but he feels it is worth the risk for the City. He then discussed the improvements made to Highway 89 as a result of the Olympics.

Council Member Sjoblom discussed the road dead ending and stopping. She is concerned it will sit like that for 20 to 30 years. Tom anticipates that development will come. Council Member Casas said it will accommodate eighty homes. Council Member Poore said the timing is not right with the budget.

Lynn Poll, 826 E. South Weber Drive, discussed the cost of the road going up 1900 East to the water tank. He said there are properties that he foresees being developed along that road in the next ten years. He asked if the City is going to pay for those roads. Tom said the City will pay for any upsizing. Lynn is concerned about the road sitting there without development. He said the City needs a new water tank. He said currently, there is existing roads in the City that need to be maintained. He feels a public hearing needs to take place.

Jan Ukena said as a citizen she isn't in favor of spending taxpayer's money for that road. She feels this kind of money can be spent better somewhere else. She suggested tabling this item.

Council Member Casas said he is in favor of the road. He discussed the poor planning of transportation in Roy. He said they did not have the foresight.

Lynn Poll asked where the water is going to drain. Tom said he will need to look at the engineering on that.

Mayor Long asked how much it would cost the developer of Riverside Place Subdivision to construct a road to City code. Jan Ukena suggested contacting Wasatch Front Regional Council.

Council Member Poore would like more of a commitment from Mr. Stephens than just an email.

Council Member Sjoblom moved to table. Council Member Poore seconded the motion. Council Members Casas, Poore, and Sjoblom voted yes. The motion carried.

DISCUSSION:**South Weber City Fiscal Year (FY) 2016-2017 Budget:**

Council Member Casas discussed page 12 line item 10-41-230 concerning \$10,000 for travel and training for conferences, educational materials, & employee travel. He isn't sure that much needs to be budgeted. He would like to cut it to \$7,000. Council Member Casas suggested cutting line item 10-41-620 (donations to Sunset Jr. High, Northridge, CFD Parade Candy, and other unclassified) in the amount of \$1,000. He also suggested cutting 10-41-925 transfer to Country Fair Days in the amount of \$6,500. He suggested cutting 10-43-140 Uniforms for \$1,000. He suggested cutting \$1,000 from 10-43-210 Books/Subscriptions/Membership for \$3,600. He suggested cutting costs from line item 10-43-220 Travel & Training for \$12,300. Mark McRae explained the training items that have been set up including ULCT Spring & Fall Conference and Caselle Conference Training. He said he will look at decreasing it by approximately \$1,000. Council Member Casas suggested cutting line item 10-43-311 for \$5,000. Mark said it can be cut. The Council agreed. Council Member Casas questioned line item 10-43-910 transfer to Capital Project Fund for \$202,000. Mark explained this being revenue. Mayor Long asked about Caselle. Mark discussed the City going paperless and said he is a strong proponent. Tom explained they would begin with utility billing. Council Member Poore questioned 10-43-740 equipment purchases for \$13,800. Mark explained items under this including domain server change, VPN integration, Caselle Time Record Management, and Standardize desktop applications.

Council Member Poore questioned line item 10-57-230 Travel and Training for \$15,200. Tom Graydon explained the State Fire School. He said there are times when he uses them but they require a certain number to attend the class. He said sometimes they go through the DATC. Council Member Poore compared the standard with other cities. She would like to see a copy of the standards. She would also like a copy of the names of the volunteers and what training each fire fighter has completed. Chief Graydon said right now there are 12 volunteers and he needs about 20. Chief Graydon said he is training all of them to do Fire I, Fire II, EMT, and Hazmat. He said he typically turns money in at the end of the year. Council Member Poore would like to cut down and try to be more exact. Chief Graydon said if the City had a full time department then he would require certifications when they apply and he wouldn't have to train. Council Member Poore said that is why she would want a list of requirements for volunteers. Chief Graydon said any volunteer has to be trained. Council Member Poore said she has been told that the standards are different for volunteers. Chief Graydon reviewed the NFPA standards with Council Member Poore. He is projecting that eight new volunteers will need to be trained this year. She is concerned about the fire school training of \$3,500 not being a requirement. Council Member Poore questioned 10-57-250 Equipment Supplies & Maintenance for \$19,000. Mark said there are a few items that need to be transferred to another category. Council Member Poore said she would like to see more accurate estimates and if it is necessary. She asked if there is anything that can be done every other year verses every year. She discussed Uintah, Sunset, and Plain City's fire department budget comparisons. Council Member Poore questioned line item 10-57-450 three hand held radios at \$6,100. Chief Graydon explained the State's requirements for radios. Council Member Poore is concerned about why South Weber City is purchasing these now when no one else is purchasing them. Tom explained this is set up like the City's vehicle replacement plan. Council Member Poore would like to have justification in writing. Council Member Poore said she would like to see building inspections contracted out. It was

decided it is too late to do that in this budget cycle. Council Member Poore questioned page 31 snow plow. Tom said that is not a purchase for this year. Mark is going to remove this. She questioned the funding for RSL plan. Tom explained this is a plan for roads. She questioned line item 10-60-140 uniforms cleaning costs for \$1,200. It was her understanding that they would be changing that. Tom feels they are frugal with their money. They have to present their old stuff and shirts are bought in bulk. Mark said the cleaning covers repair as well. He said there are items that you wouldn't want going through your personal washing machine. Mark said from prior years the budget has been \$1250 per person. Tom said in meeting with Mark Larsen he said he can cut it to \$750 per year per employee. The Council agreed on the \$750.

Mayor Long asked about line item 10-60-250. Mark explained that is the upkeep or repair on equipment and operating supplies including fuel and oil. Council Member Poore asked if fuel can be a separate item. Mark said it can be done, but it would have to be done in every budget line. Council Member Poore and Casas were in agreement. Council Member Sjoblom didn't have an opinion. Council Member Casas questioned line item 10-60-420 Weed control for \$5,000. He doesn't see a need for it to be this high. Mayor Long questioned line item 10-60-271. She asked if the City knows exactly which lights we are paying for. Council Member Casas researched this last fall and Mark Larsen has made a list of the street lights the City is responsible for. Tom said the City is responsible for the park and ride. Mayor Long questioned line item 10-61-411 Snow Removal for \$30,000 for Class "C" Roads. Mark explained that this is mainly salt that was purchased in 2013-2014. He said salt purchase is difficult for cities to estimate. Mark will add "salt" to snow removal.

CITY COUNCIL ITEMS:

Council Member Sjoblom:

Senior Singles Meeting: Council Member Sjoblom gave a presentation at the Senior Singles Meeting last night.

Council Member Casas moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:10 p.m. Council Member Poore seconded the motion. Council Members Casas, Poore, and Sjoblom voted yes. The motion carried.

APPROVED: _____ **Date**

Mayor: Tammy Long

Transcriber: Michelle Clark

Attest:

City Recorder: Elyse Greiner

